# 1NC v Militarism

## 1

#### In attempt to preserve European manhood, the West’s creation of the “Color Line” was done so under the guise of objectivity. In order to understand the world, we are forced to look through the lens of the white bourgeoisie. Discursively and institutionally legitimized, this line created a space of Otherness in which the continent of Africa was trapped. The 1AC’s focus on militarism is a decadent plea within white anthropology that solidifies the colonialized object in a system of social hierarchies. It is in this divide that European conceptions of Man or any identity are formed. In a world in which the 1AC is centered on discussions of militarism without understanding that militarism is simply a product of the European conception and a man then they will never understand whiteness causes militarism and their understanding of black people as militaristic denies the space of otherness the are locked into.

#### Wynter ‘03:

Sylvia Wynter—2003 (“Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument,” CR: The New Centennial Review, Volume 3, Number 3,257-337)

The Argument proposes that the new master code of the bourgeoisie and of its ethnoclass conception of the human - that is, the code of selected by Evolution/dysselected by Evolution- was now to be mapped and anchored on the only available "objective set of facts" that remained. This was the set of environmentally, climatically determined phenotypical dif- ferences between human hereditary variations as these had developed in the wake of the human diaspora both across and out of the continent of Africa; that is, as a set of (so to speak) totemic differences, which were now harnessed to the task of projecting the Color Line drawn institutionally and discursively between whites/nonwhites - and at its most extreme between the Caucasoid physiognomy (as symbolic life, the name of what is good, the idea that some humans can be selected by Evolution) and the Negroid phys- iognomy (as symbolic death, the "name of what is evil," the idea that some humans can be dysselected by Evolution)- as the new extrahuman line, or projection of genetic nonhomogeneity that would now be made to function, analogically, as the status-ordering principle based upon ostensibly differ- ential degrees of evolutionary selectedness/eugenicity and/or dysselected- ness/dysgenicity. Differential degrees, as between the classes (middle and lower and, by extrapolation, between capital and labor) as well as between men and women, and between the heterosexual and homosexual erotic preference - and, even more centrally, as between Breadwinner (job- holding middle and working classes) and the jobless and criminalized Poor, with this rearticulated at the global level as between Sartre's "Men" and Natives (see his guide-quote), before the end of politico-military colonial- ism, then postcolonially as between the "developed" First World, on the one hand, and the "underdeveloped" Third and Fourth Worlds on the other. The Color Line was now projected as the new "space of Otherness" principle of nonhomogeneity, made to reoccupy the earlier places of the motion-filled heavens/non-moving Earth, rational humans/irrational animal lines, and to recode in new terms their ostensible extrahumanly determined differ- ences of ontological substance. While, if the earlier two had been indispen- sable to the production and reproduction of their respective genres of being human, of their descriptive statements (i.e., as Christian and as Mam), and of the overall order in whose field of interrelationships, social hierarchies, system of role allocations, and divisions of labors each such genre of the human could alone realize itself- and with each such descriptive state- ment therefore being rigorously conserved by the "learning system" and order of knowledge as articulated in the institutional structure of each order - this was to be no less the case with respect to the projected "space of Otherness" of the Color Line. With respect, that is, to its indispensability to the production and reproduction of our present genre of the human Mam, together with the overall global/national bourgeois order of things and its specific mode of economic production, alone able to provide the material conditions of existence for the production and reproduction of the ethnoclass or Western-bourgeois answer that we now give to the question of the who and what we are.

#### The creation of the Racism/Ethnicism complex legitimized a global system of antiblackness resulting in a “truth” that coincides with that narrative and an extermination of anything contradictory. The starting point of the 1AC forecloses its ability to not just recognize eurocentricism but to interrogate its reliance on antiblackness. Militarism is bad but the 1AC fails to interrogate who perfects it – i.e whiteness

#### Wynter 06:

Syliva Wynter—2006 ( “Interview with Syliva Wynter,ProudFlesh Interview: New Afrikan Journal of Culture, Politics & Consciousness, Issue 4)

SYLVIA WYNTER: I want to remind you of what Black Studies asked for. Gerald McWhorter in “The Case of Black Studies” [from Armstead Robinson, Craig Foster and Donald Ogilvie’s Black Studies and the University] (1969), he said, “I would like to refer you to an essay by the late Dr. DuBois in What the Negro Wants, where he said that up until the point that he really came to terms with Marx and Freud he thought that truth wins. But when he came to reflect on the set of lived experiences that he had and the notions of these two men he saw that if one was concerned about surviving, about the good life and moving any society toward that, then you have to include a little something other than an interesting appeal to truth in some abstract universal sense.” So he’s contradicting the truth of what I had been taught about the negativity of everything Black and the positivity of everything white. Okay? The question then is the issue of “truth.” Remember, he’s saying this in ’69. In the ’70s [Michel] Foucault comes up with the idea of “truth and power,” and he’s saying the exact same thing. He’s saying that every society has a regime of truth. So what our consciousness has been battling against, the regime of “truth” which has structured our “consciousness,” is functioning against our best interests. It is negating ourselves; and so there’s this constant struggle. You see, it’s not just an intellectual struggle. You could call it a psycho-intellectual struggle. Then you could understand why in the ’60s it wasn’t just a call for Black Studies; it was a call for Black Aesthetics, it was a call for Black Art(s), it was a call for Black Power. It was an understanding that, as Lewis Gordon has been the first to keep insisting, we live in an anti-Black world--a systemically anti-Black world; and, therefore, whites are not [simply] “racists.” They too live in the same world in which we live. The truth that structures their minds, their “consciousness,” structures ours. SO THE GREAT BATTLE NOW IS GOING TO BE AGAINST “THE TRUTH.” THE ARGUMENT PROPOSES THAT THE STRUGGLE OF OUR NEW MILLENNIUM WILL be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e., Western bourgeois) conception of the human, Man, which overrepresents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of secur- ing the well-being, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves. Because of this overrepresentation, which is defined in the first part of the title as the Coloniality of Being/ Power/Truth/Freedom, any attempt to unsettle the coloniality of power will call for the unsettling of this overrepresentation as the second and now purely secular form of what Aníbal Quijano identifies as the "Racism/ Ethnicism complex," on whose basis the world of modernity was brought into existence from the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries onwards (Quijano 1999, 2000), 2 and of what Walter Mignolo identifies as the foundational "colonial difference" on which the world of modernity was to institute itself (Mignolo 1999, 2000).3 The correlated hypothesis here is that all our present struggles with respect to race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, struggles over the environment, global warming, severe climate change, the sharply unequal distribution of the earth resources (20 percent of the world s peoples own 80 percent of its resources, consume two-thirds of its food, and are responsible for 75 percent of its ongoing pollution, with this leading to two billion of earth s peoples living relatively affluent lives while four billion still live on the edge of hunger and immiseration, to the dynamic of overconsumption on the part of the rich techno-industrial North paralleled by that of overpopu- lation on the part of the dispossessed poor, still partly agrarian worlds of the South4)- these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle. Central to this struggle also is the usually excluded and invisibilized situation of the category identified by Zygmunt Bauman as the "New Poor" (Bauman 1987). That is, as a category defined at the global level by refugee/economic migrants stranded outside the gates of the rich coun- tries, as the postcolonial variant of Fanons category of les damnés (Fanon 1963)- with this category in the United States coming to comprise the crim- inalized majority Black and dark-skinned Latino inner-city males now made to man the rapidly expanding prison-industrial complex, together with their female peers- the kicked-about Welfare Moms- with both being part of the ever-expanding global, transracial category of the homeless/the jobless, the semi-jobless, the criminalized drug-offending prison population. So that if we see this category of the damnés that is internal to (and interned within) the prison system of the United States as the analog form of a global archi- pelago, constituted by the Third- and Fourth-World peoples of the so-called "underdeveloped" areas of the world- most totally of all by the peoples of the continent of Africa (now stricken with AIDS, drought, and ongoing civil wars, and whose bottommost place as the most impoverished of all the earths continents is directly paralleled by the situation of its Black Diaspora peoples, with Haiti being produced and reproduced as the most impover- ished nation of the Americas) - a systemic pattern emerges. This pattern is linked to the fact that while in the post-sixties United States, as Herbert Gans noted recently, the Black population group, of all the multiple groups comprising the post-sixties social hierarchy, has once again come to be placed at the bottommost place of that hierarchy (Gans, 1999), with all incoming new nonwhite/non-Black groups, as Gans's fellow sociologist Andrew Hacker (1992) earlier pointed out, coming to claim "normal" North American identity by the putting of visible distance between themselves and the Black population group (in effect, claiming "normal" human status by distancing themselves from the group that is still made to occupy the nadir, "nigger" rung of being human within the terms of our present ethnoclass Mans overrepresentation of its "descriptive statement" [Bateson 1969] as if it were that of the human itself), then the struggle of our times, one that has hitherto had no name, is the struggle against this overrepresentation. As a struggle whose first phase, the Argument proposes, was first put in place (if only for a brief hiatus before being coopted, reterritorialized [Godzich 1986]) by the multiple anticolonial social-protest movements and intellectual chal- lenges of the period to which we give the name, "The Sixties.”

#### This is why even if you say we should do everything of the sake of deconstructing militarism, because black is seen as negative, you gun ban will disproportionally affect those occupying negative spaces

Gourevitch June 30th, 2015 ALEX. "Gun Control’s Racist Reality: The Liberal Argument against Giving Police More Power." Saloncom RSS. Salon, 24 June 2015. Web. <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun\_controls\_racist\_reality\_the\_liberal\_argument\_against\_giving\_police\_more\_power/>.

The dead are buried, the murderer apprehended, and the shock has started to wear off. Now comes the public reaction to the massacre in Charleston.¶ Soon after the shootings at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, the first black president of the United States offered some thoughts on Dylan Roof’s racist attack. First and foremost, President Obama said, recent events were about how “innocent people were killed in part because someone who wanted to inflict harm had no trouble getting their hand on a gun.” The killings were also about a “dark chapter in our history,” namely racial slavery and Jim Crow. Obama only suggested practical action regarding the first issue, namely gun control.¶ He did not consider that such measures will make the persistence of the second problem even worse.¶ It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice.¶ As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority.¶ While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence.¶ This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece¶ “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.”¶ In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following:¶ “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.”¶ This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations.¶

#### Alt: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ only for white people.

#### Our wynters evidence is a net benefit to the alternate—we control framing militarism is not independent of whiteness as the casual relationship—this indicates we should ban it for White people—not the people who have to deal with impacts of whiteness. The value of self-defense is key to challenging the logics of white supremacy. Civil rights progression for blacks happened since black people were armed. The 1ac doesn’t take into account the unique position black people have when they use guns – rather than embodying militarism they are a response to militarism.

John **Blake** *Does race shape Americans’ passion for guns?* John Blake is a native of Baltimore, Maryland. He writes about race, religion, politics, and other assorted topics. CNN Enterprise writer/producer October 12, 20**14**

It's a mistake to think that our gun culture is lily-white, historians say. **Contemporary blacks may be some of the strongest supporters of gun control, but the black community has a strong gun rights tradition, particularly in the South. Guns helped spawn the civil rights movement,** says Cottrol, the history professor at George Washington University. **White vigilantes who tried to attack black communities were met at times by gunfire.** The Deacons for Self-Defense, an armed black group, protected civil rights activists, says Cottrol, author of "The Long, Lingering Shadow: Slavery, Race and Law in the American Hemisphere." **Southern blacks in particular recognized the value of owning guns because they couldn't depend on anyone else to protect them during a time when the sheriff could be a member of the Klan,** historians say. **"The civil rights movement was made possible because the Klan knew that black communities were armed,"** Cottrol says.

#### Black political leaders are calling for the second amendment to be put to use in the context of black life being threatened by police brutality.

Taylor **Gordon***Black Leaders in Arkansas Urge Black People to Arm Themselves With Guns and Cameras* Taylor Gordon is a writer for Atlanta Black Star. April 16th,20**15**

**In the midst of what seems to be a never-ending wave of unarmed Black citizens being killed by police, Black leaders are now pushing for the community to take action by arming themselves with guns** and video cameras. **The**[**Black community’s attitude towards gun control**](http://atlantablackstar.com/2015/04/04/black-citizens-lose-faith-law-enforcement-major-shift-happens-support-carrying-concealed-weapons/)**has seen a major shift in recent years as the cruelty of police brutality has garnered national attention.** While many still remain unsure about whether or not it is best to bring more guns into their communities, **local leaders in Arkansas are very clear about their stance on the matter. “We’re asking that Black people around the country arm themselves and join in established gun clubs,”** Hubert Bass, CEO of the Crittenden County Justice Commission, told Memphis station WREG. Shabaka Afrika, the president of the Crittenden County NAACP, mirrored those sentiments. **Both of these local leaders insisted it isn’t a call for more violence but rather a precautionary action to make sure the Black community has its own line of defense when the police fail to serve and protect them.** These two certainly aren’t the first to make this push in the very community that once strongly advocated for more gun control. Just a few weeks ago, Samuel Mosteller, longtime president of the Georgia chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, also urged the Black community to “exercise their Second Amendment rights.” Mosteller expressed a clear frustration with the fact that so many Black citizens were being fatally attacked by police regardless of their actions leading up to the tragic encounter. **“You stand there, [police] shoot,”** Mosteller told reporters back in March. **“You run, they shoot. We’re going to have to take a different track.”** Data released by the Pew Research Center found that many members of the Black community are also having a change of heart about concealed carry laws. **Researchers found that more than 50 percent of Black people were now in favor of using firearms to “protect people from being victims of crimes.”**

#### Your “solvency advocate” would agree with the CP. Giroux literally says that whatever discussion we do have about ending gun violence must not criminalize young people of color. The blanket statement of the affirmative is only a reappropriation of the status quo. Giroux 16:

Giroux, Henry. *Gun Culture and the American Nightmare of Violence.* http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/34349-gun-culture-and-the-american-nightmare-of-violence

As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws matter, social responsibility matters and a government responsive to its people matters, especially when it comes to limiting the effects of a mercenary gun culture. But more has to be done. The dominance of gun lobbyists must end; the reign of money-controlled politics must end; the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture, and the ongoing militarization of US society must end. At the same time, it is crucial, **as participants in the Black Lives Matter movement have argued**, for Americans to refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color. Moderate calls for reining in the gun culture and its political advocates do not go far enough because they fail to address the roots of the violence causing so much carnage in the United States, especially among children and teens. For example, Hillary Clinton's much publicized call for controlling the gun lobby and improving background checks, however well intentioned, did not include anything about a culture of lawlessness and violence reproduced by the government, the financial elites and the defense industries, or a casino capitalism that is built on corruption and produces massive amounts of human misery and suffering. Moreover, none of the calls to eliminate gun violence in the United States link such violence to the broader war on youth, especially poor youth of color.

#### Because we are winning that whiteness causes militarism, that means banning it from white people solve and prevents the criminalization of youth of color via Giroux evidence

(cx- enforcement) do we talk to nra people? Do we read more books?

## Case

### ROB

#### Vote for the debater who best deconstructs Eurocentric knowledge production

Prefer:

a.) wynters said mitarism problematic, but stems from overarching system that deselects certain individuals to be victims of mitlaitirism and why militarism exists i.e, foreign countries they talked about—most of people end up killing by military are black and brown which are deslected from euoprean conceptions of man

b.) this is a better standard, it makes the burden of the aff proves that all individuals embody mitairlism, because their advocacy si still base don a universal gun ban

c.) its important this rob because it calls into question the ways in which we formulate knowledge in the first black, if we show that blackness is still negtative and whiteness as positive it coopts any “solvency” of the aff in regards to miltairms

### Value

#### Racism is consistent violence—since it will never end if my alt or your plan happens, we should not ban guns in general from those who need the value for self defense

Tommy J. **Curry—**20**15** (Associate Professor of Philosophy @Texas A&M University, “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense,” Radical Philosophy Review 18.1 [2015]: 45-68)

The foreigner laughed at Robert F. Williams when he described the “segregated pet cemetery in Washington D.C. where an Afro-American cannot bury his dog,” but such extremity was indicative of the segregationist psychology that emerged from the racist logics of white America. **If one accepts**, as Williams does, **that “The stranglehold of oppression cannot be loosened by a plea to the oppressor’s consciousness,” then the theorist and activist both seem committed to at least understanding** Williams claim: **“Social change in something as fundamental as racist oppression involves violence.”** To some, the notion of a pre-emptive self-defense sounds strange. While there is a long standing tradition of self-defense, the protection of one’s self or property against siege, such a stance is thought to be an exception; only responding to the most egregious transgressions against an individual. There is a similar but different understanding at work in *Negroes with Guns*. **Racism determines the boundaries between white humanity and what they define as their relationship to that which is not human.** Such distance means that **whites will rarely perceive a violation of Black rights or a devaluing of Black humanity, so violence is never-ending.** As such, Williams contends that “**you cannot have progress here without violence and upheaval, because it’s a struggle for survival for one and a struggle for liberation for the other.” Racism** then **is consistent violence against the oppressed such for the sake of preserving their distinction and distance from the white oppressor class**. Simply stated, “The racist is a man crazed with hysteria at the idea of coming into equal human contact with Negroes.” (64-65)\

### Turns

#### First, Handgun ban forces criminals to switch to deadlier weapons—substantially increases murder rates. Kopel[[1]](#footnote-1)

If we have plausible **evidence** to **suggest[s]** that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur **in the United States**? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson **that if [merely] 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone.** [185] **A National Institute of Justice study** of felons in state prisons **found** that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] **A 72% substitution rate [which] would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose.**

#### Second, Handgun bans foster illegal market—increases crime. Kopel 2

Dixon expects the "fact that such guns are inaccurate and dangerous to the user will also act as a restraint to illegal gun production." [129] How much of a restraint may be open to doubt. **While homemade guns will not win target- shooting contests,** target shooters will have their own guns (kept at shooting ranges under the Dixon proposal), and homemade guns may suffice for robbery purposes. And most **homicides,** like most robberies, **are perpetrated at very close range where accuracy is not an issue.** The risk that a homemade gun could explode in a shooter's hand may deter some otherwise law-abiding citizens who would want to own an illegal handgun for protection. On the other hand, **if** the **[a] person believes that the threats to his or her life and family are serious enough to commit the serious crime of buying an illegal handgun, the** additional **risk posed by potentially defective handgun may seem small.** In addition, **newfound popularity for bootleg guns might result in handguns becoming cheaper** than they are now, just as in alcohol prohibition days, bootleg gin often cost less than legal alcohol had. **If handguns were cheaper,** they might become more available to small-time teenage criminals and other low-end miscreants; **criminals might end up more widely armed than ever before. The inevitable black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime.** As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, **the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more.** Dixon also acknowledges that **illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders.** [130] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year).

#### Case study of Washington DC proves—handgun bans in the US cause more murder. Kopel 3

Finished with international comparisons, Dixon turns to interstate analysis. **If gun controls reduced crime, then it would be expected that states with stricter gun laws would have lower gun crime rates. But** as Dixon acknowledges, **states with stricter gun laws have higher crime rates.** [113] There are several possible explanations. First, the states which enacted the strict gun laws had high crime to begin with; that it why the stricter laws were enacted. A second, not inconsistent explanation, is that **gun control itself causes higher crime,** making the already high-crime states even worse than they would otherwise be. Dixon deals with the explanation by dismissing it as "perverse." [114] Argument by epithet is not persuasive, and (as will be discussed below), there are plausible reasons to believe that some gun controls may increase crime, and that Dixon's proposed handgun ban would substantially aggravate crime. [115] Dixon admits that **at least sometimes handguns prevent crime,** [116] **so it is hardly "perverse" to suggest that it could be possible that states which weaken the deterrent effect of civilian handgun ownership suffer increased crime.** A third explanation for why states with stern gun laws have more crime than other states is that **guns from other states,** with looser laws, **are smuggled** into the high crime states, **thus reducing or eliminating the crime-reductive effect of the strict state's law.** This explanation is not inconsistent with the first two explanations. Dixon devotes the rest of his interstate discussion to arguing for this third explanation. Even if Dixon's explanation about leakage is generally true, it remains difficult to account for the dismal performance of many gun controls. For example, **in 1976 the Washington, D.C. murder rate stood at 26.9 per 100,000 population,** according to FBI statistics. **The city** council **enacted a handgun ban** which went into effect in February \*316 1977, **and since then the Washington rate has** always **been higher than 26.9** (except in 1985). [117] **Today, the rate is three times higher than it was before the ban was enacted. [**118] If handgun bans work, why would the homicide rate rise after 1977 (which was years before the "war on drugs" made Washington's homicide problem even worse)? Smuggling guns into Washington, D.C. from other states was no easier in 1980 than it was in 1976. The ban on possession by law-abiding citizens should have reduced the supply of handguns available for Washington, D.C. criminals to steal, and should have prevented law-abiding citizens from shooting each other with handguns in heat-of-passion homicides. The D.C. handgun ban's impact on law-abiding citizens would not be defeated by interstate smuggling, since law- abiding citizens would, be definition, not buy an illegal gun. And yet the Washington homicide rate rose. **[there are] Similar increases in gun crime** in other jurisdictions, **such as [in] Chicago after its own handgun ban,** [119] **and [in] New York City after its** severe "Sullivan" **handgun licensing law,** [120] at least raise doubt about the complete sufficiency of interstate gun smuggling as an explanation for the failure of the gun laws. If interstate smuggling were the whole story, then it would not be expected that crime rates would rise immediately after gun laws were enacted.

# Frontlines

### AT Pics Bad

O/V –

1. Their use of pics bad

2. We have a better analysis of militarism

It’s funny how the affirmative reveals that black people are not militaristic with guns but rather use guns as a response to militarism being imposed on them and the negative said we are not educational enough This overview will impact turn their theory shell premised off of education because their conceptions will always come from the perspective of the oppressor, dually allowing it to function as a counter interp. Evaluate substance first, but this is also a substantive argument. If you even look at the theory flow this is the first place you look. This overview is a game over issue.

Extend the roj to unlearn exclusionary practices – if I can prove that their model prevents you from breaking down exclusionary practices that is an offensive reason you vote them down straight turns theory shell since – your endorsement of their form of knowledge perpetuates exclusionary practice

Extend the rob to challenge Eurocentric knowledge production – you only pertuate it that by enforcing normative conceptions of rules like pics are bad by deradicalizing a critical academic space for your personal needs of fairness/education

Your author impact turns your use of theory:

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

In a market-driven system in which economic and political decisions are removed from social costs, the flight of critical thought and social responsibility is further accentuated by what Zygmunt Bauman calls "ethical tranquillization."6 One result is a form of depoliticization that works its way through the social order, removing social relations from the configurations of power that shape them, substituting what Wendy Brown calls "emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems."6 Consequently, it becomes difficult for young people too often bereft of a critical education to translate private troubles into public concerns. As private interests trump the public good, public spaces are corroded, and short-term personal advantage replaces any larger notion of civic engagement and social responsibility. Under such circumstances, to cite C. W. Mills, we are witnessing the breakdown of democracy, the disappearance of critical intellectuals and "the collapse of those public spheres which offer a sense of critical agency and social imagination."8 Mill's prescient comments amplify what has become a tragic reality. Missing from neoliberal market societies are those public spheres - from public and higher education to the mainstream media and digital screen culture - where people can develop what might be called the civic imagination. For example, in the last few decades, we have seen market mentalities attempt to strip education of its public values, critical content and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to consumerism, risk-free relationships and the disappearance of the social state in the name of individual, expanded choice. Tied largely to instrumental ideologies and measurable paradigms, many institutions of higher education are now committed almost exclusively to economic goals, such as preparing students for the workforce - all done as part of an appeal to rationality, one that eschews matters of inequality, power and the ethical grammars of suffering.9 Many universities have not only strayed from their democratic mission, they also seem immune to the plight of students who face a harsh new world of high unemployment, the prospect of downward mobility and debilitating debt.

#### Attempting to foreclose the conversation destroys the radical imagination necessary to rupture neoliberalism.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Not only does neoliberalism undermine both civic education and public values and confuse education with training, it also wages a war on what might be called the radical imagination. For instance, thousands of students in both the United States and Canada are now saddled with debts that will profoundly impact their lives and their futures, likely forcing them away from public service jobs because the pay is too low to pay off their educational loans. Students find themselves in a world in which heightened expectations have been replaced by dashed hopes and a world of onerous debt.21 Struggling to merely survive, the debt crisis represents a massive assault on the imagination by leaving little or no room to think otherwise in order to act otherwise. David Graeber is right in insisting that the student loan crisis is part of a war on the imagination. He writes: Student loans are destroying the imagination of youth. If there's a way of a society committing mass suicide, what better way than to take all the youngest, most energetic, creative, joyous people in your society and saddle them with, $50,000 of debt so they have to be slaves? There goes your music. There goes your culture. . . . And in a way, this is what's happened to our society. We're a society that has lost the ability to incorporate the interesting, creative and eccentric people.22 Questions regarding how education might enable students to develop a keen sense of prophetic justice, utilize critical analytical skills and cultivate an ethical sensibility through which they learn to respect the rights of others are becoming increasingly irrelevant in a market-driven university in which the quality of education is so dumbed down that too few students on campus are really learning how to think critically, engage in thoughtful dialogue, push at the frontiers of their imaginations, employ historical analyses, and move beyond the dreadful instrumental, mind-numbing forms of instrumental rationality being pushed by billionaires such as Bill Gates, Amazon's Jeff Bezos, Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg and Netflix's Reed Hastings. In this world, "all human problems are essentially technical in nature and can be solved through technical means."23 As the humanities and liberal arts are downsized, privatized and commodified, higher education finds itself caught in the paradox of claiming to invest in the future of young people while offering them few intellectual, civic and moral supports.24 Higher education has a responsibility not only to search for the truth regardless of where it may lead, but also to educate students to be capable of holding authority and power accountable while at the same time sustaining "the idea and hope of a public culture."25 Though questions regarding whether the university should serve strictly public rather than private interests no longer carry the weight of forceful criticism as they did in the past, such questions are still crucial in addressing the purpose of higher education and what it might mean to imagine the university's full participation in public life as the protector and promoter of democratic values. Toni Morrison is instructive in her comment that "If the university does not take seriously and rigorously its role as a guardian of wider civic freedoms, as interrogator of more and more complex ethical problems, as servant and preserver of deeper democratic practices, then some other regime or ménage of regimes will do it for us, in spite of us, and without us." 26 What needs to be understood is that higher education may be one of the few public spheres left where knowledge, values, and learning offer a glimpse of the promise of education for nurturing public values, critical hope, and what my late friend Paulo Freire called, "the practice of freedom." It may be the case that everyday life is increasingly organized around market principles; but confusing a market-determined society with democracy hollows out the legacy of higher education, whose deepest roots are philosophical, not commercial. This is a particularly important insight in a society where the free circulation of ideas is not only being replaced by mass-mediated ideas but where critical ideas are increasingly viewed or dismissed as either liberal, radical, or even seditious.

#### You have an ethical obligation to vote aff over theory.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Higher education represents one of the most important sites over which the battle for democracy is being waged. It is the site where the promise of a better future emerges out of those visions and pedagogical practices that combine hope, agency, politics and moral responsibility as part of a broader emancipatory discourse. Academics have a distinct and unique obligation, if not political and ethical responsibility, to make learning relevant to the imperatives of a discipline, scholarly method, or research specialization. But more importantly, academics as engaged scholars can further the activation of knowledge, passion, values and hope in the service of forms of agency that are crucial to sustaining a democracy in which higher education plays an important civic, critical and pedagogical role.

This is their use of t is a reason they are delinked from their own rob of rejecting miltairms – preptuating it by normalizing academic spaces

#### Now on the shell proper, E the wynters evidence -- PICS are justified only in the contexts of debates about where the aff starts conversations about militarism but makes colorblind statements. The neg not only concerned with black to negative spaces, but white with positive spaces pic justified because it called out whiteness and says no your are not positive, rather perpetuator of militarism.

**Debate about method and justification**

This is a methods debate - the Specificity of methods are key- of the broad claims of the aff has collateral damage- black people- black people are collateral damage to the 1acs militant measure against militarism

AT Steals Ground: -- If your assumptions are antiblack we must be able to critique it c/a grioux 13

### AT Work together

#### This assumes whiteness will act justly

#### Tommy Curry writes: Curry, Tommy J. [doctor in Associate Professor of Philosophy, Affiliated Professor of Africana Studies, Texas A & M University] In the Fiat of Dreams: The Delusional Allure of Hope, the Reality of Anti-Black Violence and the Demands of the Anti-Ethical. 2013. SPHS//SS

**Traditionally we have taken ethics to be**, as Henry Sidgwick’s claims, "**any rational procedure by which we determine what individual human beings 'ought'—or what is right for them**—or to seek to realize by voluntary action.”vii **This rational procedure is** however **at** **odds with the empirical reality the ethical deliberation must concern itself with. To argue,** as is often done, that the government, its citizens, or **white people should act justly, assumes that the possibility of how they could act defines their moral disposition.** **If a white person could possibly not be racist, it does not mean that the possibility of not being racist, can be taken to mean that they are not racist.** **In ethical deliberations dealing with the problem of racism, it is common practice to attribute to historically racist institutions, and individuals universal moral qualities that have yet to be demonstrated. This abstraction from reality is what frames our ethical norms** **and allows us to maintain**, despite history or evidence, **that racist entities will act justly given the choice.** Under such complexities, **the only ethical deliberation concerning racism must be anti-ethical, or a judgment refusing to write morality onto immoral entities.**

### AT High theory

#### The 1AC is the epitome of high theory. Yes, we can agree that discussion of culture are important, but there is no tangibility to the affirmative because there is no method outlined. Either they defend the implementation of the policy but have no solvency in regards to saving or protecting lives OR they defend the plan as a discussion of values but don’t tell you HOW that value comes about. The inability to pinpoint to passage to materiality centered around militarism or gun violence proves that the 1AC can never deal with a lived reality. Curry 14:

Dr. Tommy J. **Curry** The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century. 20**14**

Despite the pronouncement of **debate** as an activity and intellectual exercise pointing to the real world consequences of dialogue, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues of racism, sexism, economic disparity, global conflicts, and death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity are fixed to a paradigm which **sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other**. In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get at the concrete problems in our societies. At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definition with normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, [it is set] against factual/descriptive issues.”At the most general level, **the** conceptual **chasm between** what emerges as ***actual* problems** in the world **(e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty, disease, etc.) and how we frame such problems** *theoretically*—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—**is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm**, since such a paradigm **insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively**. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that **for any** actual-empirical-observablesocial phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. **This gap between what is *actual***(in the world), **and what is represented** by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds **threatens any real discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures which necessitate tangible policies and reorienting changes in our value orientations**. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon—meaning **we cannot suggest that** the **various complexities of social problems** (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects we observe) **are totalizable by** any **one set of theories within an ideological frame** be it our most cherished notions of Afro-pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like. At best, theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world, but even this awareness does not command us to *only* do X, but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a whole, debate (policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics. How then do we pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage? It is my position thatDr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our attempts to impose value reorientation be it through critique or normative gestures) upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to reformulate the values which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on the flawed views of the worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice, fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our contemporary moral parameters.

### AT Turns same

#### Not an overall ban

#### Reason why its bad indepdent of NC

### CX

Why vote aff

How do you stop militarism

NO what is method

Does that mean enforcement?

What does it mean to be miltairts

What causes miltairism

So…ima be straight forward how are black people embody militarism?

Violence of past activist allowed civil rights to continue…

### At neo lib bindivi

Black resistance has always been about the collective

Movements before allows civil rights to not use violent as a first means

No sense of individuals in which society views them already as one body to be anhiliated

### AT long guns

“use long guns—“ that’s still part of the culture then --- handguns are not symbolic if rifiles are just as deadly

#### Long gun substitution is 10 times more deadly and likely to happen—surveys prove. Kleck 86

Policy Lessons from Recent Gun Control Research Author(s): Gary Kleck Source: Law and Contemporary Problems, Vol. 49, No. 1, Gun Control (Winter, 1986), pp. 35-62 Published by: Duke University School of Law

Long gun substitution is a very undesirable prospect because **rifles and shotguns**, depending on caliber or gauge and the ammunition used, **can be** anywhere from one and one-half to **ten times as deadly as handguns**.59 It is unlikely that criminals willing to violate the strongest social and legal prohibitions against violence would conscientiously opt for only the least deadly varieties of long guns and ammunition.60 Unless this occurred, however, **the result of an effective handgun-only measure would be an increase in criminal homicide deaths.** The precise extent of this increase would depend on two parameters: the fraction of assault-prone people, otherwise inclined to use handguns, who would substitute long guns in their assaults (the substitution fraction), and the ratio of the deadliness of the substituted long guns to the deadliness of handguns which otherwise would have been used in the absence of handgun controls (the deadliness ratio). The higher either parameter is, the more likely it would be that the net effect of the measure would be an increase in the number of homicides. If X is used for the substitution fraction and Y is used for the deadliness ratio, the relationship between the two has been computed as 8649.19 X = 6827.53Y-455.581 at the point where there is neither a net gain nor a net loss from the handgunonly policy.61 If X is larger, then Y must be smaller in order to prevent an increase in homicides.62 It is difficult to know for sure what type of long guns and ammunition would be substituted by criminals if handguns were not available, so the magnitude of the deadliness ratio is not certain. An estimate of three or four seems reasonable. That is, **the substituted long guns would be about three to four times as likely to produce a death as handguns** currently used in assaults. As to the size of the substitution fraction, the best estimate comes from the Wright and Rossi prison survey.63 Inmates were asked what they would do if they wanted to carry a handgun but could not obtain one. **Among** those **prisoners** who reported they had committed crimes with a gun "many times," "most of the time," or "all of the time," **seventy-two percent said that they would carry a sawed-off shotgun or rifle instead.**64 **Substitution of long guns in ownership would almost certainly be higher, since many people would acquire a long gun as a substitute for owning a handgun, but would not carry it as frequently as they would their handgun.** Thus, **substitution** in carrying might be about seventy-two percent but substitution in ownership **could be anywhere from seventy-two to one hundred percent.**

### Framing

If the aff is purely about symbols—we are winning because we show that whiteness is the only manifiestation of miltairism banning it form white people symbolically solves the aff

Additionally, the neg better alt of symbolic action calls into question consincous winter talking, white alwayus positive, which means if we actively say whitenes sis not positive, we are better chalnege of miltairsm and deconstruction euroc knowledge production

If it is material—the 1ac stops black people from having guns and instead

### 2NR

1. Whiteness causes militarism
2. CP resolves the entirety of the aff
3. Presumption.

If I can say says an antimilitarism aff has collater damage, they are done

Heres the people you ignore

1. Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-1)